

REMARKS

Claims 3-9 and 54-64 are pending in this application. Claims 4, 5 and 56 have been amended and claims 63 and 64 have been added. Applicants are of the opinion that the Examiner has failed to form a prima facie case of obviousness of the previously pending claims. However, in the interest in expediting prosecution Applicants have elected to amend the claims. The foregoing amendments are taken in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicant would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3-9 and 54-62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious based upon U.S. Patent No. 6,164,953, to Winget, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,776,942, to Kim. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants maintain their position that the asserted rejections of the previously pending claims by the Examiner are improper. Notwithstanding, Applicants have amended the claims to recited additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Applicants intend to re-assert the previous arguments should the claims be once again rejected by similar arguments.

By amending the application, the Applicants do not concede that the patent coverage available to them would not extend as far as the original claim. Rather, Applicants reserve the right to file a continuation application to pursue the breadth of the claims as filed. Applicants believe that the Examiner has not made a sufficient showing of inherency of the teachings of the asserted prior art, especially given the lack of teachings in the cited references of the properties that Applicants have recited in their claims.

Further, by the present amendment, it does not follow that the amended claims have become so perfect in their description that no one could devise an equivalent. After amendment, as before, limitations in the ability to describe the present invention in language in the patent claims naturally prevent the Applicants from capturing every nuance of the invention or describing with complete precision the range of its novelty or every possible equivalent. See, *Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu*

Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 62 USPQ2d 1705 (2002). Accordingly, the foregoing amendments are made specifically in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, the Examiner's rejections are believed to be rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any question or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (248) 292-2920.

If for some reason Applicants have not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1097 for any fee which may be due.

Date:

July 9th 2007

James M. McPherson

James M. McPherson
Registration No. 53,306
Dobrusin & Thennisch PC
29 W. Lawrence Street, Suite 210
Pontiac, MI 48342
248-292-2920
jmcpherson@patentco.com
Customer No. 25,215